HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 18 Saturday, May 5, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Labor In Political Action: One great test of the political power of the union labor bosses — using funds of many unwilling dues-paying members — is now under way and is being watched closely by Capital experts on labor. This test (unnoticed by most of the nation) is in the Third District of North Carolina, where Representative Graham Barden, Democratic conservative and long an opponent of the labor bosses, is "running scared" for the Democratic renomination. Renomination in this District, having few Republicans, is tantamount to re-election. Barden for the first time is opposed for the nomination. Union funds are reportedly pouring into the District to help the drive to defeat Barden.

The reason that the labor bosses have concentrated their fire on this Congressman is that as Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he has obstructed attempts of the labor lobby to amend the Taft-Hartley Act and pass other legislation demanded by that lobby. (The chairman of a Congressional committee possesses great power to advance, delay or to kill legislation.)

If the bosses could defeat Barden, the next ranking Democrat on the Committee is Representative Augustine Kelley, a "liberal" and pro-labor. Next after Kelley in line of succession is Representative Adam Clayton Powell, leftist from the Harlem district of New York. Hence, even if Barden's opponent should prove quite as conservative as the incumbent has been, his victory over Barden would signify a defeat for the forces in Congress which seek to modify and restrain the great political power of the labor bosses. [See article — by Russell Turner — in this week's issue.]

Political Talk: The political seismograph in the Capital this week registers a spate of rumors to the effect that President Eisenhower will not run again — will, it is asserted, bow out for reasons of health just before the GOP convention. So far as HUMAN EVENTS can ascertain, there is no concrete information to support these reports. On Capitol Hill, it is noticeable that these rumors seem to be on the lips of Democratic rather than Republican members. However, be they true or not, those members (including Republicans) who had heard the reports gave them more thoughtful attention this week after it was announced that the President would limit his campaign appearances to only a half-dozen TV shows.

● Fear of a party split spurs intense behind-the-scenes activity in the Democratic hierarchy — according to word conveyed to us from prominent Democrats. Leaders of that party seek, in various ways, to prevent a walk-out by the Southerners at the convention this coming summer. We are informed that the Democratic High Command has "field agents" at work in southern centers, to remind convention delegates and others of the dangers of a split, and also to remind members of Congress that a bust-up would affect their seniorities and appointments to chairmanships of committees, with all the power attached thereto.

MAY 9 1956

The earnestness of this effort is underlined — say Capital observers — by the fight in Texas to send a slate headed by Senator Lyndon Johnson to the convention. This is opposed by one led by Governor Shivers. The former is pledged not to bolt the convention; the latter would be bound by no such commitment.

Not Merely Gossip: A member of the HUMAN EVENTS staff interviewed Mr. Willard Edwards, *Chicago Tribune* writer, after he had returned from Princeton where he had addressed the students on the subject of Alger Hiss — a day before Hiss talked to the students under the auspices of a student debating society which received nationwide criticism for its invitation to Hiss to speak. Edwards, years ago, had covered the Hiss case for

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his paper. "I simply related the facts of the Hiss affair to the boys and they seemed genuinely interested," said Edwards. "They obviously knew very little about Hiss or his background. Why their teachers and professors had failed to give them the facts, I don't know. But they seemed very desirous of getting the real story. The college paper had given me a rather chilly reception the day I arrived, but the morning following my talk, changed its tone. I received a standing ovation from the students on conclusion of my speech."

● Newspaper row in the Capital is stirred by reports that a New York book and magazine publisher has obtained a copy of the minutes of the Eisenhower cabinet meetings and is preparing an edited text for publication. Questions raised here are: Who in the White House "leaked out" the materials? Why wasn't it given to all the press? Is this to be a sort of campaign yearbook?

● Last week, David Greenglass and Harry Gold testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee and disclosed many details of how Soviet espionage utilized the Rosenberg atom spies, as well as Gold and Greenglass, to obtain U.S. military secrets. These two men, although guilty of giving away secrets to the Soviets, did cooperate with the Government in helping prosecution of the Rosenbergs in an effort to make amends for their treasonable activities. They received long prison sentences which they are now serving. Their testimony of last week was taken as further evidence of their desire to help their country.

Hence, the proposal is being privately made in Government circles that these two men should be pardoned, or their sentences reduced for good behavior. Apart from the justice of such a move in view of the services rendered, it is felt that remission of the sentences would serve a useful purpose — to encourage other Reds to turn state's evidence. Renegade Reds have usually been treated to such savage press persecution (such as that accorded to Whittaker Chambers and Paul Crouch) that self-interest might well prompt others to keep quiet. The spectacle of Gold and Greenglass serving out long sentences, despite their cooperation with the Government, scarcely encourages others to "defect."

Democratic Evolution: The ultra-liberal program to be presented to, and probably forced through, the August Democratic National Convention in Chicago is in the process of formulation, and indications are it will be designed deliberately to provoke a walkout by conservative southern delegates.

Recently, the United Automobile Workers, probably the most political-minded of all American labor unions, held its 7th "education conference" here in Washington. First day's highlight: Presentation of the UAW's 20th Anniversary "Freedom Awards" to New York's far-left Senator Herbert H. Lehman and to Thurgood Marshall, general counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Second day: A round-robin debate of campaign issues between two Democratic and two Republican Senators. Loud cheers for the Democrats, the ubiquitous Estes Kefauver and Minnesota's Hubert Humphrey; for the Republicans, California's William F. Knowland and Nebraska's Carl Curtis, a cool hearing interspersed with boos and catcalls.

Third day: More cheers for Adlai Stevenson in one of his most bitter attacks yet on the Eisenhower Administration, and for UAW President Walter Reuther's demand that the Democratic party return to the liberalism which he said has been largely abandoned.

But all this is just a warm-up for another national convention to be held in Washington next week — this one for the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), which needs no introduction. Even before the meeting, ADA is making it clear that it intends to ram through the Democratic convention a drastic civil rights program designed to leave Southerners no choice but to walk out, *a la* 1948. Furthermore, ADA's influence on the Democratic party nationally is such that it probably can do just what it sets out to accomplish at the convention.

The ADA meeting will feature addresses by three of the UAW speakers — Reuther, Lehman and Humphrey — as well as by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Roy Wilkins, President of the NAACP. It may decide who ADA will support for the Democratic Presidential nomination; indications are it will not be Stevenson, on grounds he is not sufficiently "liberal."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Planned Economy: The New York taxicab situation provides an excellent example of how a "planned economy" works against the public interest because political power replaces the free market as the controlling influence.

In the 1930's, the New York City Council set a limitation of 11,000 cabs, the number then in operation. The right to own each cab was represented by a "medallion." In the beginning the medallion had only a nominal value, but each year, especially since 1940, it has climbed until today it is worth about $14,000.

About one-half of the cabs in New York City are owned by individuals, the other one-half by corporations — some owning a few cabs, some owning hundreds. Buyers often borrow the cost of a medallion from relatives or friends, or they can borrow about two-thirds of the current price from New York banks. Bankers regard such a loan as "safe" because they take for granted that it will be politically impossible to increase the number of medallions.

The owner — even an individual owning a single medallion — no longer has to operate the cab himself to make a good return on his $14,000 investment. He can rent his cab to two or three hackers, thus keeping it running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week — less repair time. On a commission basis, he gets between 50 and 57½ per cent of the metered collections.

The average daily collections from a two-shift operation seem to run about $44, so the owner's share of a two-shift operation is about $22 per day. Out of these proceeds, he must pay upkeep, insurance and the like. The drivers get the tips, which in New York average about 33 per cent of the metered sums, or about $7 per 10 or 12-hour day.

Taxi drivers themselves are the first to admit that the number of taxis in New York is grossly inadequate. On rainy days, or in the late afternoon, or after the theater, it is often impossible to find a cab, especially outside the midtown area.

Nevertheless, no candidate for mayor or for member of the Council is willing to propose the desperately needed increase in the number of cabs; he knows he would face certain defeat from the bitter opposition of the thousands of individual cab owners, the taxi corporations and the lending institutions who now have a vested interest in the present maximum. Therefore, taxi owners take for granted that their $14,000 medallions should climb each year in price as the shortage becomes greater.

Letter from WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, JR., Editor-in-Chief, Hearst Newspapers: "For the past ten years I have been a constant reader of HUMAN EVENTS and always find it very informative and enlightening, with material not found elsewhere."

Beck Backdown: The power struggle between George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, and the two bosses of that organization's largest affiliate, the 1,400,000-member International Brotherhood of Teamsters, is taking on the earmarks of a resounding victory for Meany. Whether Meany will chalk up the few finishing touches necessary to cement that victory, remains to be seen.

Meany won his immediate point when Captain William V. Bradley, President of the gangster-and-racketeer-ridden International Longshoremen's Association, announced abandonment of its working alliance with the Teamsters. The announcement came just four days before this week's special meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, summoned by Meany for the specific purpose of deciding whether to take disciplinary action against the Teamsters for entering into that agreement.

The pact was negotiated by James R. Hoffa, free-swinging, tough vice president of the Teamsters, as a step toward his ambition of taking over full control of all waterfronts on the East and Gulf coasts and the Great Lakes. When Meany challenged the alliance, however, Teamsters' President Dave Beck re-emerged from his recent relative obscurity to assume the role of front man defending the pact.

Bradley's announcement took some of the steam out of this week's Council meeting. Beck, a member of the Council, absented himself on the flimsy excuse of "previous commitments." But the Council, while accepting as fact the abandonment of the agreement, nevertheless decided it must discuss "the principle involved" with Beck at its next regular meeting, June 5.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having scored his initial advantage, labor observers muse, will Meany now let the matter drop or will he push it further to curb the free-wheeling, free-raiding, we'll-take-in-everybody, tactics of the Teamsters as led by Beck and Hoffa?

Nuclear Hazards: Confirmation of warnings in HUMAN EVENTS of dangers in industrial exploitation of nuclear power have piled up in recent weeks. In an article, "Nuclear Nonsense" (February 11), David Shea Teeple, former Assistant to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, had maintained that the location of atomic power plants near centers of population, constituted an unwarranted hazard at the present stage of reactor technology. The following recent developments now serve to fortify this view:

(1) The Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 15 held a seminar on the insurance problems concerning atomic power; important industrial figures stated that at the present time they would not assume the responsibility for placing this deadly radioactive material in the vicinity of large cities. (Presently, a reactor is being set up in Shippingsport, Pennsylvania, within a short distance of the Pittsburgh metropolitan area.)

(2) Senator Herman Welker, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, March 20, warned that the present atomic power program might result in catastrophies since the hazards had not been fully explored.

(3) On April 6, the Atomic Energy Commission was forced to admit that on November 29, 1955, an atomic reactor accident had occurred at the Idaho test site. The AEC sought to pretend that even its own officials had no knowledge of this accident which was so serious that the installation is still inoperative.

(4) Washington observers note with ironic amusement that Senator Clinton Anderson, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who had been promising the American people air-conditioned cities with atomic power, on April 16 hastened to tell the American Bar Association meeting at Hartford that (a) a nuclear reactor is a potentially dangerous instrument; (b) the fission products are more toxic and insidious than any substance theretofore known; (c) a major reactor accident could contaminate a wide geographic area; (d) no completely safe reactor has as yet been designed and constructed; and (e) the conceivable damage from a reactor accident is far greater than that which could result from any type of industrial accident.

Working For The Government: This phrase has gained considerable currency as an exasperated expression, by the average American, of his awareness that taxes are so heavy he actually works part of the time for Uncle Sam. According to some authorities, about 35 cents of every dollar the average American earns goes to pay taxes of all kinds, direct and indirect.

According to the New York *Daily News*, a Florida businessman named Dallas L. Hostetler, for some years has been pondering an original line of calculation. Every year, he calculates the date that year when the average American has earned enough to pay all his taxes for the year and can begin "working for himself." His calculations have been based on current tax rates all over the country. He calls it "Tax Freedom Day." This year it is on May 7. The *News* comments: "Last year, the date was May 10; the year before, May 17. However, in 1948, when Hostetler got his inspiration, the glorious day fell on April 27. So we have quite a distance to go before we regain the ground lost since then."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 18 HUMAN EVENTS May 5, 1956

Article Section

UNIONISM: THE GROWING BIG BUSINESS

By RUSSELL TURNER

WHETHER it's good or bad depends on the individual point of view. But whatever the view, the fact remains that unionism has become one of the nation's biggest businesses; that its influence is reaching into every nook and corner of the nation's economic and social structure; that it is achieving a political power rivaling anything known in American history.

Nowhere is this more true than right here in the nation's Capital, which now houses the headquarters of 42 national labor unions representing some 6,500,000 workers, plus the national offices of the newly-unified AFL-CIO and two additional unions which are moving their headquarters here this spring from other cities. Of major significance is the fact that 11 of the 42 have moved their headquarters here from other parts of the country in approximately the last decade.

The explanation of union leaders for this Washington-ward trek is that it facilitates maintenance of relations with other unions headquartered here and with governmental agencies with which they must deal, such as the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Labor.

The explanation of all realistic observers is that the unions want their headquarters handy to the seat of Government, so that they can impress that impressionable Government with their economic and political power and influence.

It is by being here in Washington that union leaders can exercise their most effective influence on the policies of Government, both legislative and administrative. They need not even bother registering as lobbyists to do it. Cocktail party or luncheon conversations with legislators or executive department functionaries are far more effective in putting across a union's point of view than testimony before a Congressional committee or a quasi-judicial agency hearing.

Furthermore, the same legislators and functionaries cannot help but be impressed when they see unions spending multiple millions of dollars for swank new buildings just to house their headquarters offices.

For example, the bumptious, freewheeling International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with a claimed membership of 1,400,000 (and growing rapidly), last year moved its headquarters into an ultra-modernistic, marble-faced, plush-officed edifice three blocks from Washington's Union Station, on the construction of which it had just spent $5,000,000. It is directly across a small park from the Senate Office Building.

MAY 9 1956

The Teamsters' Union has no legislative representative, none of its officers or employees even are registered as lobbyists. They piously profess disdain for such out-of-the-union-line activities.

But if a Senator happens to look out his office window in a contemplative moment, and sees the roof-gardened, tinted-glass-windowed "Taj Mahal" across the park, his thoughts may stray back to views on some pending legislative matter which were expressed at X's party a few days ago by an official of the Teamsters' Union. Quite conceivably, it might pass through his mind that he should consider carefully before crossing an organization powerful enough to

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erect such a structure just to provide office space for some 100 headquarters' employees.

A Representative driving by the building, or viewing it from a back window of the Capitol itself, might well have the same reaction.

Other union headquarters' buildings may not be quite so strategically located, but they are impressive nevertheless. Some $3,500,000 is going into the soon-to-be-completed AFL-CIO headquarters building just across Lafayette Park from the White House. The Machinists Union has just moved into its still-being-completed $2,500,000 building on Connecticut Avenue just off famed Dupont Circle; the Operating Engineers are erecting a $2,000,000 structure across 17th Street from the Mayflower Hotel; the Electrical Workers are being relatively pikerish with the $750,000 job they are putting up on 16th Street, one block up from the Statler Hotel. Old buildings presently are being razed to make way for a new home for the Bakery Workers union across the street from the Statler; the United Steel Workers have bought property in the same block for a reported $1,000,000 on which they apparently plan ultimately to erect a headquarters.

Some unions admittedly and openly indulge in lobbying, and so register under the 1946 Federal Lobbying Regulation Act. A *Congressional Quarterly* compilation of lobbying registrations and spending reports for 1955 shows 20 unions thus listed; six of them, however, are post-office employee groups which in effect must bargain with Congress on such matters as wages and hours.

The AFL and CIO filed separate reports for the 11 months of 1955 prior to their merger, and a third report covering unified activities in December. Together, the three reports listed 1955 expenditures for the purpose of influencing legislation totalling $236,011 — which would have been twice the amount so spent by any other organization. The leading lobby spender for the year was the National Association of Electric Companies with $114,835. The six postal workers' unions, in their separate ways, together spent a total of $226,757.

These reports, in a major sense, are highly misleading, in that, as mentioned above, much of the most effective lobbying comes on a person-to-person basis and is far beyond the reach of any lobbying expenditures report. That person-to-person influence, however, is tied in not only with the open manifestations of union power to be seen in such ways as luxurious new office buildings; it is tied in perhaps even more directly with the growth of another arm of the octopus-like power of unionism — its burgeoning political activities.

THE political power of the labor union movement is becoming so great that, in effect, it threatens to topple of its own weight if given a more-than-gentle legislative nudge. For that weight is growing to the point where it is arousing much resentment in the minds of millions of Americans, including millions of unwilling dues-paying union members — resentment against union bosses who are trying to dictate a form of socialistic welfare state in lieu of the traditional free enterprise system under which this nation has prospered and grown for nearly 200 years.

That resentment is comparable to the unrest of a half to three-quarters of a century ago over the conduct of avaricious industrial and financial tycoons — unrest which led to enactment of such regulatory statutes as the anti-trust laws and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The present-day resentment is headed in the direction of comparable regulation of union activities.

The union bosses realize full well that such feelings are developing throughout the country. Yet, even as they seek with one hand to allay the public fears and resentment with protestations about labor merely seeking to protect its rights, they drive ahead relentlessly with the other hand toward their goal of outright domination of all legislative and governmental processes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For example — the official political arm of the AFL-CIO is its Committee on Political Education, purportedly financed entirely by voluntary contributions in order to get around the Taft-Hartley Law's ban on expenditure of union funds for political purposes. It is known as COPE.

The March 31 issue of the *AFL-CIO News* bore this headline across the top of its front page: "COPE Opens Dollar Drive To Protect Labor's Gains."

What this quaintly euphemistic union-ese means is that the AFL-CIO bosses would like a one dollar contribution to the COPE campaign kitty, please, from each of the roughly 15,000,000 AFL-CIO members.

No one seriously believes there is the remotest possibility that COPE will succeed in its dollar-per-member drive. But union bosses are persuasive; shop stewards, for instance, are highly influential among, and frequently greatly feared by, their constituents. It is entirely conceivable that COPE may gather in a dollar a piece from a third, perhaps a half, of the 15,000,000 AFL-CIO members; some will give more than a dollar.

That will mean a COPE campaign fund of somewhere between five and ten million dollars, to be parcelled out as its managers see fit; a truly substantial sum, as campaign funds go.

This kitty will be used to promote the candidacies of "liberals" who, as legislators or executive officeholders, would be amenable to suggestions from the AFL-CIO or its affiliates. The major point of amenability this year in state races will be adamant opposition to right-to-work laws; in Congressional races, support for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law's Section 14b, which legalizes such state statutes. This is the big issue of the moment, to labor unions. This also is what the *AFL-CIO News* means when it says, "To Protect Labor's Gains."

But as substantial as it is, this prospective five-to-ten-million-dollar COPE kitty takes no account of other millions which will be siphoned from regular union treasuries into political channels by various means.

WHEN it wrote the ban on union political expenditures into the Taft-Hartley Law in 1947, Congress thought it would keep unions out of politics, just as corporations are prohibited by law from engaging in political activities. The ban has failed.

As a "for instance," there is the case of the United Automobile Workers, headed by the far-left Walter Reuther. The UAW for some time has sponsored regularly certain radio and TV news programs in Detroit. During the 1954 Congressional campaigns, the UAW's commentator presented several Democratic candidates on these programs, interviewed them in the most favorable light, and openly stated the union's endorsement of them.

The UAW was indicted on charges of violating the Taft-Hartley Law's no-politics clause; the violation, on the surface, appeared clear. But appearances can be deceiving; a Federal judge in February ruled that since the UAW paid for the programs regularly, its endorsement of the Democratic candidates was not a political activity but rather was a valid exercise of its freedom of speech.

The political organization financial reports, filed with the clerk of the House of Representatives in compliance with Federal law, also indicate other means of evading the Taft-Hartley no-politics clause. The Senate Republican Policy Committee staff has gone through those reports, and compiled a full listing showing that union political arms spent $1,978,564 in connection with the 1954 Congressional campaigns.

Theoretically, all of this money was accumulated through voluntary donations. But even here there are gimmicks. Again, we cite the UAW as a case in point.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The CIO-PAC reports are broken down into two sections — an "individual contributions account," and an "educational account." Presumably the first is for outright politics, the second merely to educate union members.

During the year 1954, and prior to election day, the UAW made six contributions to the National CIO-PAC "educational account" totalling $150,769. Coming from the union, the money must have come out of its general treasury and thus from its regular dues and initiation fees.

During the same period, there is listed an expenditure from the CIO-PAC "educational account" of $5,000 to the Michigan State CIO Council. Under the "individual contributions account" are listed these expenditures for 1954: May 17, Moody (the late Democratic Senator) for Senator Committee, $2,500; Aug. 13, two items to the UAW-PAC for $15,000 and $10,000; Oct. 6, $5,000 to the (now-Senator Pat) McNamara Campaign Committee, $3,000 to the Wayne County (Detroit) CIO Committee, and $1,000 each to three Democratic Congressional candidates in Detroit.

On their face, these reports seem to show the UAW contributing financially to the campaign funds of various candidates through the CIO-PAC. There undoubtedly are a substantial number of Republican members of the UAW who take a dim view of having their dues payments go for such purposes but, being a minority, they are unable to stop their union's leftist bosses.

Like the lobby reports, the political expenditures reports also are misleading, in that they give no hint of the amounts being ladled out by unions for the succor of favored candidates in local and state campaigns. Nor do they give any hint of items such as the UAW news program endorsements.

THERE is a growing tendency for Members of Congress, in private conversations, to say they think the time has come when unions should be subjected to the same anti-trust and Corrupt Practices Act regulations as now apply to corporations. But Members of Congress are human; they face elections this fall, they are loathe to incur new enmity by expressing these thoughts openly.

It should not be so. Few Americans quarrel with the Corrupt Practices Act ban on political expenditures by corporations; there should be no more quarrel with imposing the same ban on unions whose funds are collected from members required to join in order to hold their jobs.

Only by such a ban — and an effective one, with teeth — can the dangerously-growing political power of unions be curbed. The national welfare demands that it be curbed.

If you wish to encourage Members of Congress to pass legislation putting unions and corporations on the same basis with reference to political expenditures, you should sit down and write your Congressman. Promise him you will fight as hard *for* him as the union leaders, he antagonizes, will fight against him.

From our conversations with Senators and Representatives since receiving the above article, we can tell you that the proposed restriction upon union political expenditures has a good chance of passage — *if enough people will urge Congressmen to do what most of them already strongly want to do.*

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

Russell Turner, a Washington, D. C., newsman for 22 years, is staff assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr., National Radio Commentator. Mr. Turner also serves as Washington correspondent for *Partners*, Chicago monthly magazine covering the field of labor-management relations. His last article appeared in HUMAN EVENTS on March 3, 1956 — "Highway Robbery — The Teamsters Union: It'll Probably Be Worse."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED